

CABLEGRAM

STATE

MR V.V. GIRI  
PRESIDENT  
UNION OF INDIA  
CARE INDEMBASSY  
SOFIA (BULGARIA).

I UNDERSTAND GOVERNOR DR. REDDI HAS RECOMMENDED IM  
OF PRESIDENT'S RULE IN UTTAR PRADESH (.) REPORT WHO  
UNTENABLE PARTISAN AND MOTIVATED (.) INDEPENDENT J  
OF HIGHEST EMINENCE HAVE WITH ONE VOICE DISAPPROVED  
GOVERNOR'S ACTION HOLDING IT TO BE UNCONSTITUTIONAL  
MR. SETALVAD FORMER ATTORNEY GENERAL MR SV GUPTA FOR  
SOLICITOR GENERAL MR MC CHAGLA DR. LM SINGHVI MR. SA  
PRASAD FORMER CHIEF JUSTICE AND MR CB AGRAWAL FORMER  
HAVE UNRESERVEDLY OPINED THAT GOVERNOR'S ACTION IS U  
TUTIONAL AND HIGHLY IMPROPER (.) ADVOCATE GENERAL A  
REMEMBRANCER OF UTTAR PRADESH HAVE ALSO ADVISED GOVE  
AGAINST HIS ACTION (.) ASSEMBLY IS UNDER SUMMONS AN  
DUE TO MEET ON SIXTH REPEAT SIXTH OCTOBER (.) SPEAR  
WELL AS GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE HAD UNANIMOUSLY DECIDE  
TEST OF MAJORITY SHOULD BE IN LEGISLATURE (.) MOREO  
HAVE DEMONSTRATED TO THE GOVERNOR THAT CLEAR AND SUI  
MAJORITY OF LEGISLATORS SUPPORTS ME AND ARE AGAINST  
MOVE (.) I HAVE ALSO SUGGESTED THAT THE GOVERNOR MA  
THE ASSEMBLY EARLIER THAN SIXTH OCTOBER TO TEST MAJO  
SUPPORT FOR ME (.) UNDER THESE CIRCUMSTANCES GOVERN  
REPORT SUGGESTING PRESIDENT'S RULE IS CLEARLY IN VIO  
OF CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS PRECEDENTS ACCEPTED PRA  
AND INCONTROVERTIBLE FACTS (.) I REQUEST YOU NOT TO  
ANY ORDERS UNTIL YOU RETURN TO INDIA AND UNTIL YOU A  
FULL POSSESSION OF FACTS AND THE TRUE POSITION (.)  
TIONAL PROPRIETY AND NATURAL JUSTICE REQUIRE THAT YO  
BE FULLY INFORMED AND HEAR THE OTHER SIDE BEFORE REA  
AND CONSIDERATION ( ) MAY BE NECESSARY OF ANY DECISION

The proclamation of Presidential rule has been in effect for so long that it provokes no particular reactions. While it is not for me to impute motives, it cannot be said that the way the Assembly has been suspended, procedure offers no example of its kind in the world of parliamentary democracy.

It was clear that if Congress (R) could not attract a majority, all constitutional processes would be suspended in U.P. This has happened, but it will be worthwhile to know how my friends of the Congress (R), have shifted their position.

At first my removal was sought because it was felt that I had lost majority. Then it was contended that the majority in the Council of Ministers wanted my removal. It was argued that I should have been dismissed because I refused to resign when asked to do so by the Governor.

When I <sup>had</sup> asked for removal of certain Ministers, on their own and their leadership's attempts to wear down members of BKD, the Assembly was scheduled to meet on 10 days ahead. Also, it became manifest immediately despite the withdrawal of Congress (R) support, Govt. was to enjoy a majority in the House. So far as majority of the Council of Ministers wanting my removal is concerned, it was not due to any friction in the working of the Council but because of external pressure following the withdrawal of Congress (R) from the coalition. In fact, once the leadership had decided upon withdrawal which they were proclaiming from house-tops for weeks past, it is Congress Ministers who should have resigned far before I had to resign for their removal.

Nor did I refuse to comply with the Governor's request asking me to resign. I had only sought some clarification vital to the functioning of representative government,

Lastly, it has been argued that the new coalition which gave me majority in the House, did not hold a promise of stability. May be, but how could it be except on the floor of the House? Because at present Congress (R) is the ruling party at the Centre, it always throw or keep out of office any coalition which does not include its own state unit, on the ground not looking stable.

Since the meeting of the Assembly today was three days away, the imposition of President's rule nothing but a denial of the right of the Assembly to determine not only the question of majority, but also of stability.

As I have already said in my statement of September the Congress (R) leadership is preparing for a mid-poll which suits their MPs, though not their MLAs.

Dated 2nd Oct., 1970.

(CHARAN SINGH)

